REMARKS

In the Office action mailed 10/19/05, claims 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35

USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Takayama (US 5,991,842). Applicant traverses this

rejection and submits the following arguments.

Applicant asserts that Examiner has mischaracterized the definition of the word

"transport." Based on Examiner's arguments in the Office Action mailed on October 17,

2005, it is apparent that the Examiner believes a transport to be a device. Applicant has

defined and claimed a transport as being a transmission protocol, which cannot be

construed to be a device. Applicant directs Examiner's attention to the present

application at page 3, liness 4-5: *"The AV/C control protocol was designed to operate*

over the Function Control Protocol (FCP) transport via an IEEE 1394 bus. There is no

implementation for the AV/C protocol over any other transport other than FCP. The old

method of implementing the AV/C protocol assumes a single transport, FCP, and uses

direct calls to the FCP transport implementation. Thus, current implementations

hardwire the AV/C control protocol layer to the FCP transport layer. If another AV/C

transport layer were defined, these implementations would have to be redesigned."

The nature of the problem that the present invention solves is further described on

page 4 of the present application, beginning at line 15:

That is, a user may be able to connect a video camera to a computer if they have

the appropriate cables and protocols. However, if that user wishes to connect an A/V

system to a computer network and a video camera, matters are far more difficult, if not

impossible in many instances.

- 3 -

The present invention separates the implementation of the AV/C protocol layer and the AV/C transport layer. This allows the implementation of a AV/C transport having the same services regardless of the type of transport, whether it is FCP, asynchronous connections, SBP, Ethernet, etc.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized the meaning of the term, "transport." For example, Examiner cites Takayama at col 3, lines 35-38 as disclosing the claimed limitation of detecting a transport. However, Takayama at column 3, lines 35-38 describes detecting a device:

"A Plug & Play function, which is a characteristic of the 1394 serial bus, allows automatic recognition of equipment and its connection state when it is connected by a cable to a network."

Applicant reminds Examiner that Applicant is not trying to describe or claim a 1394 bus, but rather detection of a transport protocol.

The Examiner also cites Takayama at col. 10, lines 4-13 as disclosing the claimed limitation of detecting a transport. However, Takayama at col. 10, lines 4-13 describe the detection of a switch (switch 12) and its activation. Again, this is not the same as detecting a transport. Similarly, Examiner cites Takayama at col. 10, lines 57-59, which again describes detecting whether a switch is active or not. Also, Examiner cites Takayama at column 10, lines 63 - column 11 line 39. However, this portion of Takayama again describes detecting a mode change in a device, based on the position of switch 12. But there is no discussion in Takayama of detecting a protocol; more importantly, the plug n play capability of the 1394 bus, as described above, works with

- 4 -

ONE protocol, the FCP protocol. Conversely, the present invention allows the use of multiple transport protocols by separating the implementation of the AV/C protocol layer from the AV/C transport layer.

As for claim 5's limitation of creating a transport ID associated with the detected transport, Examiner cites Takayama at col. 4, lines 26-28 as disclosing this limitation, which reads:

"The first 10 bits of the 64-bit addressed are called a bus ID which is used for discriminating between buses."

Applicant traverses this rejection for two reasons: first, if the Examiner is referring to the device and its state (the camera and the position of switch 12) as a transport, identifying a bus (another device) from a plurality of other buses is not the same as identifying the camera and switch 12. Second, a bus is simply not a transport which is defined as a protocol.

As for the limitation of indexing the transport ID, more inconsistency is found in Examiner's reasoning. While the Examiner erroneously equates a bus ID to a transport ID, there is no showing of an indexed bus ID. Examiner again cites Takayama at column 4, lines 5-10, which makes no mention of bus ID or anything remotely resembling a transport ID. Instead, column 4, lines -10 reads:

A transaction layer as firmware is used for the management of transfer data (transaction) and issues commands such as data read and write. A serial bus management manages the connection state and ID of each connected equipment for the node control and network configuration management.

- 5 -

As for claim 5's limitation of associating the indexed transport ID with a link device, Examiner cites Takayama as disclosing serial bus management that manages the ID of each connected equipment wherein the addressing of the 1394 serial bus contains a bus ID. Without analyzing whether or not Takayama makes such a disclosure, Applicant submits that even if Takayama DOES disclose such concepts, this is irrelevant as none of this equates to a transport ID as defined and claimed in the present application. Again, a transport is a protocol, and an ID associated with the protocol is NOT a bus ID or any other device ID.

As the limitation of assigning a transport instance to a created transport ID is again concerned with an identifier tied to a communication protocol, this is not found in Takayama based on Examiner's misunderstanding of the definition of the word "transport."

As the remaining claims are dependent from claim 5, they thus inherit the limitations of claim 5 and the above arguments regarding claim 5's patentability apply to the remaining claims as well.

On the basis of the above remarks, early consideration of this application and early allowance are respectfully requested.

- 6 -